

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
WESTERN DIVISION

No. 5:14-CV-00310-F

360 MORTGAGE GROUP, LLC,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
STONEGATE MORTGAGE CORP.,	)	
Defendant.	)	


This matter is before the court on Plaintiff 360 Mortgage Group, LLC's motion [DE-289] seeking the court's reconsideration of its September 14, 2016 Order [DE-276] allowing summary judgment on all claims in favor of Defendant Stonegate Mortgage Corp.

Generally, motions for reconsideration are allowed only at the discretion of the court and only under certain circumstances: (1) to accommodate an intervening change in controlling law; (2) to account for new evidence not available at trial; or (3) to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice. *Hutchinson v. Staton*, 994 F.2d 1076, 1081 (4th Cir. 1993). Motions to reconsider "are improper if they serve merely to ask the Court 'to rethink what the Court had already thought through—rightly or wrongly.'" See *Ga.-Pac. Consumer Prods. v. Von Drehle Corp.*, 815 F. Supp. 2d 927, 929 (E.D.N.C. 2011) (quoting *Above the Belt, Inc. v. Mel Bohannon Roofing, Inc.*, 99 F.R.D. 99, 101 (E.D. Va. 1983)).

Having reviewed the case and considered the parties' arguments, the court concludes that there was no manifest error of law or fact in its September 14, 2016 Order, nor does Plaintiff present newly discovered evidence or an intervening change in the law to justify reconsideration of that decision. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion [DE-289] for reconsideration is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

This, the 6 day of December, 2016.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES C. FOX  
Senior United States District Judge